

4 December 2018

Dear

I refer to your Official Information Act request dated 28 September 2018 received via email seeking information concerning the Police announcement of an inquiry into the use of external security consultants by Police. Your request was:

1. All advice and communications (including emails) about establishing the inquiry.

For example, formal internal documentation about the decision to establish an inquiry, communications with other agencies such as SSC, the Ombudsman, Independent Police Conduct Authority or Thompson & Clark about whether and how an inquiry should be held, as well as internal emails. I'm interested in learning who (if anyone) the police consulted with, as well as what they said, and what the police officers involved thought of the proposal. For the avoidance of doubt, I am not seeking any information about the operation of the inquiry now that it has been established (so I'm not seeking evidence before the inquiry or anything like that).

On 8 October 2018 Detective Inspector Paul Berry rang to discuss your request and to advise that Police would not be able to meet the required deadline. He considered that the extensive searches required to locate information for the inquiry would hamper responding to your request on time. He also advised you that Police were extending the deadline for responding to your request until 20 November 2018 pursuant to section 15A(1) of the Official Information Act 1982.

In respect of your request please find attached the following documents:

- Various emails
- A memo from Deputy Commissioner M Clement dated 28 September 2018
- The Police inquiry Terms of Reference dated 28 September 2018

It should be noted that to ensure the independence of both the SSC and Police inquiries, Police did not directly engage with SSC inquiry members but did establish a liaison based relationship.

In respect of the various emails, information has been with-held on the grounds that some information directly relates to the current investigations underway by the State Services Commission and by Police. Therefore release of those parts are refused pursuant to s6(c) of the Official Information Act 1982 to prevent prejudice to the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial.

Secondly, parts of those documents referring to individual email addresses and direct dial and cell phone numbers have been with-held to protect the privacy of those named. Therefore this part of your request is refused pursuant to s9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA) to protect the privacy of natural persons.

Police National Headquarters

Thirdly, parts of those documents were with-held from disclosure on the grounds that the contents are legally privileged. Therefore this part of your request is refused pursuant to s9(2)(h) of the Act to maintain legal professional privilege.

A further eight additional documents were identified but with-held in full from disclosure on the grounds that the contents are legally privileged. Therefore this part of your request is refused pursuant to s9(2)(h) of the Act to maintain legal professional privilege.

You have the right to ask the Ombudsman to review my decision if you are not satisfied with the way I have responded to your request.

Yours sincerely

P Berry

Detective Inspector